VIRGINIA:

In the Court of Appeals of Virginia on Friday

the 4th ***day of*** June , 2010

Jewel D. Hill, Appellant,

Against Record No. 0858-10-2

Circuit Court No. CL08-675

Nisaa N. Muwwakkil, Appellee,

From the Circuit Court of the City of Petersburg

It appears that this court does not have jurisdiction over this case. Accordingly, the case Hereby is transferred to the Supreme Court of Virginia pursuant to Code § 8.01- 677.1.

A Copy
Teste:
"s/"
Clerk

APPENDIX A

DIRECT QUOTES FROM THE APRIL 1, 2010

2010 - 815

VIRGINIA:

IN CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE CITY OF PETERSBURG

"IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the jury verdict of Forty-Seven Thousand Dollars ($ 47,000.00) awarded to plaintiff, pro se, is appropriate and not subject to modification. It is further Ordered that the Proceeds be distributed as follows:

Tronfeld West & Durrett 4020 West Broad Street Richmond, Va. 23230	$43.73
Tucker Griffin & Barnes 307 West Rio Road Charlottesville, Va 22901	$571.49
Cannella & O'Neal 700 E. Main Street, Suite 1800 Richmond, Va. 23219	$537.96
Emroch & Kilduff, LLP 3600 W. Broad Street, Ste 700 Richmond, Va 2320	$ 502.58

The balance of $ 45,344.24 shall be paid to Jewel Hill, pro se. In addition, $ 441.00 in cost and expenses are paid to the plaintiff. "

APPENDIX B ITEM 1

{NOTE: The only cost the petitioner was allowed was the two filing fee's. The cost for the court reporters, videographers to protect her rights and the certified mail because the defense had mistakenly stated the petitioner had not mailed a motion which she had a certified receipt for, Thank God, thus; could verify Mailing. None of this cost was awarded back To petitioner, as cost items after she supplied the court with receipts and cost specifically itemized. }

{ Mrs. Poindexter, Respondent, also asked for the petitioner's Attorney's fee's that petitioner had terminated because they appeared to be less adept than Ms. Poindexter in this case and lacked the resources that she had. Mrs. Poindexter asked for these fees right after the Jury verdict immediately after the jury was dismissed. How ironic. She initially wrote the amount to total $19,057.27 plus.}

"Payments pursuant to this Order are not to be issued at the present based upon plaintiff's expressed Intention to appeal the jury verdict.

The court shall enter its final order waiving signatures pursuant to Rule 1:13. A copy of this Order shall be provided to all counsel Listed above and to plaintiff *pro se* and defense counsel. "

"Enter 4/1/10"

"s/" Pamela S. Bakewell

APPENDIX B ITEM 1 CONT.

* Is a pro se plaintiff mandated to sign an order that violates her Constitutional Rights and is it Constitutional to waive petitioner's signature?

"Virginia Courts Case Information System"

- Judgement: Plaintiff
- Final Order Date: 4/01/10
- Appeal Date: 4/27/11
- Conclude: Trial Judge With Witnesses "

The Petitioner sent a letter to the Trial Court

"Dec.7, 2010"

"RE: Jewel Hill v. Nisaa Muwwakkil

Petersburg Circuit Court Case No.:CL08-675

Dear Mr. Scott:

Plaintiff, Pro Se is kindly requesting that the Court preserve the record with Due Diligence. There are Federal Questions, which would set precedence's in this case that violates the Constitutionality of State Statutes. These issues present Questions that fall under the United States Courts Jurisdictions.

Thank you kindly for your attention to this very important matter.

Sincerely,

"s/" Jewel D. Hill"

A complaint was filed with the United States District

APPENDIX B ITEM 2

Court, and an IFP was requested. Judge Henry Hudson is supposedly reviewing the IFP this is a separate complaint.

{A writ of Certiorari was sent to the United States Court of Appeals. "The petitioner was kindly informed that the Court did not have jurisdiction over the Virginia Supreme Court for a writ ". Thus, it is within The U.S. Supreme Court's jurisdiction. The Defense received appropriate copies of the foregoing. This Trial Co urt New Order was initially sent to petitioner on the Respondent's letterhead.} A hearing was arranged in the Circuit Court of Petersburg by the Respondent's Attorney, Mrs. Virginia Poindexter and a Proposed Order sent.

"ORDER SATISFYING THE VERDICT AWARD AND DISMISSING WITH PREJUDICE"

"On March 18, 2010, the post-trial motions were heard and resulted in determination about the adequacies of the verdict, the distribution of proceeds to satisfy outstanding liens for legal expenses and services, and the award of claimed expenses to plaintiff . An Order detailing the court's rulings was entered April 1, 2010 following which Plaintiff noted her appeal to the Virginia Supreme Court.

On September 29, 2010, the petition for appeal filed by the plaintiff was dismissed by the Supreme Court of Virginia. Plaintiff's Petition for rehearing was denied on November 19,2010. There being no further appeal options and the verdict being confirmed, for good cause shown,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED That the jury verdict of Forty-Seven Thousand Dollars ($ 47,000.00) awarded To the plaintiff, pro se, has been satisfied pursuant to the court's April 1, 2010, Order and the following Distribution having been paid as of December 10, 2010:"

" The remaining balance of $45,344.24 has been paid to Jewel Hill , pro se, along with the additional sum of $ 441.00 in her costs and expenses; she refused the check in open court. The court directs that the check be placed in the court file of the matter until further Order of this Court as much as plaintiff indicates her intention to never accept the check.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this case be and same hereby is fully satisfied. The case shall be marked as dismissed with prejudice and placed in the ended matters. A copy of this shall be provided To plaintiff pro se and defense counsel."

"ENTER: 1/19/2011"

"s/" Pamela B. Bateman

{This ORDER is an obstruction of the petitioner's right to redress. I have not signed, and will not sign a check ,as if I had a fair jury trial. My Constitutional rights were egregiously violated and They Knew petitoner was Petitioning for a writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court. }

APPENDIX B ITEM 2 CONT.

VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE

CITY OF PETERSBURG

JEWEL HILL,
PLAINTIFF,

v. Case No.: CL08-675

NISAA N. MUWWAKKIL,
DEFENDANT,

ORDER

On November 3, 2009, came the parties, plaintiff pro se and defendant by counsel, and they were heard on outstanding motions in this matter not presented as Scheduled on July 15, 2009. For good cause shown it is hereby ordered:

1. On Defendant's Motion Objecting to Plaintiff's Exhibit List and Plaintiff's Voir Dire:'

a.) As to health insurance forms to include but not limited to COBRA payments, disability statements, Medicaid/Medicare submissions and claims forms all are inadmissible;

b.) Correspondence between the parties, plaintiff's written analysis, court documents, summons, and police reports are all inadmissible;

c.) Neuropsychological testing reports and other medical records based upon plaintiff's testimony are inadmissible;

d.) Physicians notes, reports, diagnostic test/reports, and all other medical documentation are all inadmissible through the plaintiff; **APPENDIX B ITEM 3**

(Custodians of Records were excluded at trial thus no medical information was heard by the jurors per Order of court)

e) Salary documentation, employment evaluations and annual review documentation, and all other materials contained in plaintiff's personnel file , are inadmissible;

f) Testimony of officer Gallagher is not excluded but will be limited as detailed by the court. **(Court Excluded him week before Trial).**

2. On the Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defendant's Objection to Plaintiff's Witness and Exhibit List , said Motion is denied as set forth above.

3. On Plaintiff's Motion to exclude Defendant's Witnesses said Motion is denied. The parties are Ordered to file Amended witness and Exhibit Lists and to provide labeled exhibits to each other and the Court. **(The Petitioner wanted foundational basis and authentification of any medical records).**

4. On the Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Pleadings to Add Nationwide Mutual Insurance Company, or John Doe as a party it is noted that this Motion was previously denied and such was confirmed by the Court. **(The plaintiff's motion was written adding UM'S and UIM's not John Doe).**

Objections of the parties are preserved. The clerk is asked to provide a copy of the entered Order to Ms. Hill and Ms. Poindexter. "

"s/" Pamela L. Barbuscia

(Bold type is petitioner's view on the order) June 15, 2010, after trial petitoner received this order stating that it had not been scanned and forwarded to all Parties from the Trial Court. **APPENDIX B ITEM 3**

VIRGINIA:

In the Supreme Court of Virginia held at the Supreme Court Building in the City of Richmond

On Wednesday *the* 29th *day of* September, 2010.

Jewel D. Hill, Appellant,

against Record No. 101243

Circuit Court No. CL08-675

Nisaa N. Muwwakkil, Appellee.

From the Circuit Court of the City of Petersburg

Upon review of the record in this case and consideration of the argument submitted in support Of the granting of an appeal, judgement complained of. Accordingly, the Court refuses the petition for appeal.

Patricia L. Harrington, Clerk

"s/"

Deputy Clerk

APPENDIX C

VIRGINIA:

In the Supreme Court of Virginia held at the Supreme Court Building in the City of Richmond on Friday ***the*** 19th ***day of*** November, 2010.

Jewel D. Hill Appellant,

against Record No. 101243

Circuit Court No. CL08-675

Nisaa N. Muwwakkil, Appellee.

Upon a Petition for Rehearing

On consideration of the petition of the appellant to set aside the judgement rendered herein on the 29th day of September, 2010 and grant a rehearing thereof, the prayer of the said petition is denied.

Upon further consideration whereof, the Appellant's motion to supplement the petition for Rehearing is denied. **APPENDIX D**

New Info. r/t Juror

"s/"

With the book during deliberation

Patricia L. Harrington, Clerk

Deputy Clerk

VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE
CITY OF PETERSBURG

JEWEL HILL,

PLAINTIFF,

v. Case No.: CL08-675

NISAA N. MUWWAKKIL,

DEFENDANT,

NISAA N. MUWWAKKIL' S ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFF 'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES

Comes now Nisaa N. Muwwakkil, by counsel, and as Answers to the Interragatories propounded byThe Plaintiff states as follows:

(a) The information in the Answers is not based solely on the knowledge of the executing party, but includes knowledge of the party, agents, representatives and attorneys unless privileged.

(b) The word usuage and sentence stucture may be of the attorney assisting in the preparation of these Answers and, thus does not necessarily purport to the precise language of the executing party.

(c) Answers To Interrogatories are attached hereto. The executing party hereby states and affirms that the attached Answers are true and accurate to the best of the knowledge and belief of

The executing party.

N. Nisaa Muwwakkil

"s/"

NISAA N. MUWWAKKIL

STATE OF **VA**

COUNTY / CITY OF **PETERSBURG** , to-wit:

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this

2nd day of **June , 2009**.

"s/"

Linda Becraft-Hall

Notary Public

LINDA BECRAFT-HALL NOTARY PUBLIC MY COMMISSION NUMBER 116190 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

My Commission Expires

4-30-2011

Virginia M. Poindexter,
(Va. State Bar No. :30216
ROBEY, TEUMER,
DRASH, KIMBRELL,
AND COUNTS
The Forest Plaza II
Building
7275 Glen Forest Drive,
Suite 300
Richmond, Virginia 22326

Petitioner's Court Reporter was used as a Notary because Nisaa Muwwakkil stated in the deposition that she did not answer the Interrogatories or supply the photo's in the Defendant's answers to the interrogatory evidenced by June 2, 2009 Deposition Transcript

TRUTH FINALLY

APPENDIX E ITEM 1 CONT.

Law Offices
ROBEY, TEUMER, DRASH, KIMBRELL & COUNTS
Employees of Nationwide ® Mutual Insurance Company
Not A Legal Partnership
Offices in Fairfax, Norfolk, Richmond and Roanoke

Richmond Office:

Richmond, Virginia 23226
Telephone (804) 288-0873
Fascimile (804) 282- 7035

July 8, 2009

Ms. Jewel Hill, Pro Se
551 Lock Lane
Petersburg, VA 23805

RE: **Jewel Hill v. Nisaa N. Muwwakkil**

Petersburg Circuit Court Case No.: CL08-675

Trial Date: July 23, 2009

Dear Ms. Hill:

This letter serves to advise you of a misunderstanding you appear to have about my correspondence to you dated June 1, 2009. I have been authorized to agree to the admission of liability provided that we proceed with a bench trial before Judge Baskervill on the issue of damages only. Due to the multiple issues raised by your proposed witness and exhibit list, coupled with your apparent failure to understand the rules of evidence, I

anticipate this case is unlikely to resolve in the one day that has been scheduled unless we dispense with a jury. I suspect we both wish to have this case ended by July 23, 2009, and we do not want to risk a mistrial or some other undesirable outcome, were we to proceed and the jury were to be prejudiced by your attempts to introduce information that is not proper for it to consider.

You have provided me with volumes of information that is not permitted to be introduced at trial but, at a bench trial, the judge could review it and give it appropriate consideration based upon applicable law. I would agree not to make as many objections since the judge will give your submissions proper weight under the law. In a jury trial, I am obligated to make all appropriate objections to preserve my client's rights to appeal an adverse result. I hope you will reflect upon this option and advise me as to your position.

I have been authorized to propose a high/low at trial of $100,000/$10,000. **In that scenario, you are guaranteed a verdict of at least $ 10,000** regardless of the outcome and a maximum recovery would be the insurance limits. That way my client, Nisaa Muwwakkil, is protected from a verdict in excess of available insurance coverage. In the absence of such an agreement, a verdict above $100,000 becomes Nisaa Muwwakkil's responsibility and puts her financial future at risk. Since you have expressed the sentiment that you do not blame her, nor do you hold her personally responsible for this situation, this insulates her a judgement beyond the coverage that might put her personal assets at

risk. As an alternative, I have authority to settle your case for **$ 20,000** to end this matter without any trial being needed.

Once you have the opportunity to review these options pleas contact me with your position. We can take up some of these issue when we appear before Judge Baskerville for the pre-trial conference on July 15, 2009. Thank you for your consideration of my proposals to bring this matter to conclusion.

Sincerely

"s/"

cc: Nisaa N. Muwwakkil

Cliff Lacks, Claims Representative

Claim No. 5345 V 016965 072904 01

The Petitioner, As a Novice was NAÏVE in Relation to The Law. She thought that the Law Demanded Truth and Justice. Now petitioner realizes it is the Misapplications of Our Awesome Laws that she, an Injured Person Fell Prey to. The Question is Even After Exposure of the Respondent's Spoliations, Motives, and Intents, will Justice Be Served?

I PRAY THIS COURT WILL NOT LET FREEDOM PERISH IN THEIR HANDS!

APPENDIX: E ITEM 2 CONT.

The Honda Accord EX Surely is Stronger than the Petitioner's Body.

Note the Petitioner's face is uneven. There is Swelling and deformities noted on the left side.

There are increases in Swelling and excoriation on the intercostals areas even with sedimentary activities.

APPENDIX F PHOTO OF SOME OF THE DAMAGES